

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached 24 sheets of drawings include Figures 1, 2A-C, 3A-Q and 4A-C and replace the original sheets including Figures 1, 2A-C, 3A-Q and 4A-C. No substantive changes have been made to the Figures.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-19 were pending in this application. Claims 1 and 11 have been amended. No claims have been added or canceled. Hence, claims 1-19 remain pending. Reconsideration of the subject application as amended is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by the cited portions of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0014422 to Notargiacomo, *et al.* (hereinafter "Notargiacomo").

Claims 1 and 11 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the Applicant's claimed invention, the support for which may be found at, for example, ¶¶ [0035]-[0039]. No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Without acquiescing to the propriety of the pending rejections, the Applicants have amended claims 1 and 11 to conclusively avoid the cited reference. Claims 1 and 11 differ from the teachings of Notargiacomo for at least several reasons. For example, in response to a user's request, a search according to the teachings of Notargiacomo returns alternative *relationships* (See, ¶ [0020], "After searching the Internet 12 and finding all the relevant information, the search engine will return a list of candidate names, i.e. *those likely to be related to the person in question*, along with a probability assessment that the identified person is indeed related to the person, as shown in FIG. 4" emphasis added). This is different from providing "multiple alternatives for at least one person of the family tree" as claim 1 recites. Hence, Notargiacomo differs from the Applicant's claimed invention for at least this reason.

Moreover, according to claim 1, as amended, a family tree is constructed from "correlated records having been subjected to one of an individual correlation process and a relationship correlation process to thereby determine a likelihood that two or more of the records represent the at least one person." Notargiacomo does not teach such correlated records. Notargiacomo appears to teach searches or random data sources, including the Internet, that have not been subjected to any sort of correlation. Hence, Notargiacomo differs from claim 1 for at least this additional reason.

Claim 1 is, therefore, believed to be allowable, at least for the reasons stated above. Claim 11 includes similar limitations and is believed to be allowable, at least for similar reasons.

The remaining claims depend from one of these two independent claims and are believed to be allowable, at least for the foregoing reasons. Moreover, the independent claims include limitations that further distinguish them from the cited reference. Specifically, for example, claims 5 and 15 relate to using one user's selection from among alternatives to provide alternatives to another user. Notargiacomo does not teach this. Hence, claims 5 and 15 are believed to be allowable, at least for this additional reason.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 21, 2006

/Irvin E. Branch/
Irvin E. Branch
Reg. No. 42,358

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300
IEB:arl
60862899 v1